

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 6, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 6, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-40 and 42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-40 and 42 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 10, 16, 18, 27, 29, 32 and 39 have been amended. Claim 41 has been cancelled. Applicant submits that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Interview Summary

On June 7, 2007, a telephonic interview was held between Randol W. Read, attorney for Applicant and the Examiner. The parties discussed the cited references including *Park* and *Dao*. Claim 27 was discussed, as an example of a claim that explicitly recites a round-trip path for a strobe signal generated by a controller back to that same controller. The parties also discussed proposed claim amendments to other claims. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments discussed would clarify the claimed subject matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10-28, 32-40 and 42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Park* (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,926). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Park* fails to teach “each and every element” as set forth in independent claims 10, 16, 18, 27, 32 and 39. For example, *Park* fails to teach a method or apparatus utilizing *a round-trip path for returning a strobe signal, generated by a controller, back to that controller*, as recited in the independent claims, OR *driving second data onto a data bus in response to receiving such a signal*.

According to *Park*, a latency pipeline controlling unit 36 outputs first and second enable signals (EDO), while a database controlling unit (34) generates a main amplifier enable signal by delaying a column selection signal (see col. 7, lines 2-13 and col. 6, lines 42-45). An FRDB strobe signal is provided when an SRDB is recharged upon reception of an SRDB data bit by bit (see col. 6, lines 51-53). A first SRDB strobe signal is provided by a regular forward data path, after first and second enable signals from the latency pipeline controlling unit 36 are activated. However, there is simply no teaching in *Park* that a strobe signal generated by a controller is fed back to the controller to trigger the driving of second data onto a bus.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 10, 16, 18, 27, 32 and 39, as well as their dependents, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Park* in view of *Dao et al.* (U.S. Publication 2006/0236018, hereinafter “*Dao*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there

must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion. For example, even if combined as suggested in the Office Action, the references fail to teach a *round-trip path for returning a strobe signal, generated by a controller, back to that controller*, as recited in independent claims 1 and 29.

As discussed above, Park does not teach that a strobe signal generated by a controller is fed back to the controller to trigger the driving of second data onto a bus. While the Examiner refers to multiple strobe signals of *Dao*, each of these strobe signals are transmitted one-way only. There is no teaching of providing a round-trip path for feeding these strobe signals back to a controller that issued them, as recited in the claims.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 29, as well as their dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

#### Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read

Registration No. 43,876

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant